

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated May 20, 2009.

Preliminarily, Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 1-12, 14-31, 33 and 34 have been allowed.

Of the remaining claims, claims 13-15 and 30-32 are stated to fail to comply with the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112. It is asserted that the specification and these claims describe a rotation prevention unit 330 having a bearing unit 331. It is contended that the specification and the figures do not allow one to understand how the means 200 are allowed to rotate when anti-rotation units 331 are mounted on means 200.

Respectfully, claims 13-15 and 30-32 are adequately and clearly supported in the specification. Please note Figs. 7 and 8. The guide unit is element 300, i.e., the wedge-shaped structure which restrictively rides longitudinally up and down in the groove 410. See Fig. 8. The guide unit is connected at one of its distal ends to the bearing 331. As with any bearing, there is an inner ring and an outer ring. The outer ring is connected to the guide unit 300. The inner ring is connected to the casing, which in turn supports the rod 200. Therefore, it is quite clear that the arrangement with the bearing unit allows the rod to rotate while preventing either the guide or the outer portion of the bearing from rotating around the longitudinal axis.

Thus, claim 13 very clearly recites that the invention also has a “rotation preventing unit”. That unit prevents the guide unit from being subjected to any rotational force. Claims 14 and 15 follow naturally. Claims 30-32 are modeled after claims 13-15.

Accordingly, the Applicant has demonstrated clearly and unambiguously that the subject matter of claims 13-15 and 30-32 is fully enabled in the instant specification. Withdrawal of the rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 is earnestly solicited.

As to claim 35 and the rejection thereof for lack of clarity, the Applicant has amended the same and believes and respectfully submits that the claim describes and distinctly claims the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, in full compliance with the dictates of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112. Withdrawal of said rejection is therefore requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON AUGUST 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK FABER LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700